



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/602,306	06/23/2000	Chris Pratley	13237-2570 (MS#142282.1)	1163
27488	7590	05/05/2004	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			BASEHOAR, ADAM L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/602,306

Applicant(s)

PRATLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Adam L Basehoar

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 February 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: The Amendment forwarded to the examiner on 02/10/04 to the original Application filed on 06/23/00.

2. Claims 1-27 remain rejected in the case. Claims 1, 13, and 20 are an independent claim.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-9 and 11-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miller et al (US: 5,896,321 04/20/99).

-In regard to independent claim 1, Miller et al teach receiving a text input (Fig. 2A: 202) into a text document in a word processing program (column 11, lines 65-67) comprising one or more components.

-Identifying a partial text component (equivalent to erroneous text component) from said one or more text components (Fig. 2A: 204).

-Selecting the partial text component for editing by detecting a pause in the receipt of data entry (column 4, lines 32-33).

-Receiving notice of the pause and displaying a list of alternatives to the partial text component via a user interface opened into the text document (Fig. 2A).

Art Unit: 2178

-Receiving additional characters (edits) (Fig. 4: 402), after displaying the list of alternatives (Fig. 4: Step 418 through Step 402), directly into the text component in the text document, wherein the edit is a partial entry (i.e. one character of the desired alternative.)

-Producing additional filtered list of alternatives in response to receiving additional characters (edits)(Fig.4: 402 & 418) and displaying the revised filtered list (Fig. 4: 418).

-Selecting an alternative from the revised list (column 4, lines 50-53)(Fig. 2A: 210) and replacing directly into the text document the selected alternative (Fig. 2B: 212).

-Closing the user interface (column 5, lines 31-35)(Fig. 4: 428).

-In regard to independent claim 13, Miller et al teach receiving a text input (Fig. 2A: 202) into a text document in a word processing program (column 11, lines 65-67) comprising one or more components.

-Identifying a partial text component (equivalent to erroneous text component) from said one or more text components (Fig. 2A: 204).

-Selecting the partial text component for editing by detecting a pause in the receipt of data entry (column 4, lines 32-33).

-Receiving notice of the pause and displaying a list of alternatives to the partial text component via a user interface opened into the text document (Fig. 2A).

-Receiving additional characters (edits) (Fig. 4: 402), after displaying the list of alternatives (Fig. 4: Step 418 through Step 402), directly into the text component in the text document, wherein the edit is a partial entry (i.e. one character of the desired alternative.)

Art Unit: 2178

-Producing additional filtered list of alternatives in response to receiving additional characters (edits)(Fig.4: 402 & 418) and displaying the revised filtered list (Fig. 4: 418).

-Continually filtering the list of alternatives (Fig. 4: 418) by continuing to receive a character input (Fig. 4: 402) whenever an acceptance command (Fig. 4: 424) is not received because no suitable alternatives are selected. Miller et al further teach if in response to additional characters and further filtering, no alternative from the list is accepted (Fig. 4: 404), using the inputted word directly into the document (Fig.4).

-Closing the user interface (column 5, lines 31-35)(Fig. 4: 428).

-In regard to independent claim 20, Miller et al teach receiving a text input (Fig. 2A: 202) into a text document in a word processing program (column 11, lines 65-67) comprising one or more components.

-Identifying a partial text component (equivalent to erroneous text component) from said one or more text components (Fig. 2A: 204).

-Selecting the partial text component for editing by detecting a pause in the receipt of data entry (column 4, lines 32-33).

-Receiving notice of the pause and displaying a list of alternatives to the partial text component via a user interface opened into the text document (Fig. 2A).

-Receiving additional characters (edits) (Fig. 4: 402), after displaying the list of alternatives (Fig. 4: Step 418 through Step 402), directly into the text component in the text document, wherein the edit is a partial entry (i.e. one character of the desired alternative.)

-Producing additional filtered list of alternatives in response to receiving additional characters (edits)(Fig.4: 402 & 418) and displaying the revised filtered list (Fig. 4: 418).

- Identifying a completed alternative text component within the list of alternatives associated with the partial entry (Fig. 2A) and displaying the suggested matching completed text alternative component directly into the text document (Fig. 2A). Miller et al further teach receiving an acceptance command with the suggested completion (column 4, lines 50-55)(Fig. 2A) and in response to the acceptance command replacing directly into the document the matching completed alternative (Fig. 2B).

-Closing the user interface (column 5, lines 31-35)(Fig. 4: 428).

-In regard to dependent claims 2, and 21, Miller et al teach continually filtering the list of alternatives (Fig. 4: 418) by continuing to receive a character input (Fig. 4: 402) whenever an acceptance command (Fig. 4: 424) is not received because no suitable alternatives are selected. Miller et al further teach if in response to additional characters and further filtering, no alternative from the list is accepted (Fig. 4: 404), using the inputted word directly into the document and closing the user interface (Fig. 4: 428).

-In regard to dependent claim 3, Miller et al teach identifying a completed alternative text component within the list of alternatives associated with the partial entry (Fig. 2A) and displaying the suggested matching completed text alternative component directly into the text document (Fig. 2A). Miller et al further teach receiving an acceptance command with the suggested completion (column 4, lines 50-55)(Fig. 2A) and in response to the acceptance

Art Unit: 2178

command replacing directly into the document the matching completed alternative (Fig. 2B) and closing the user interface (Fig. 2B).

-In regard to dependent claims 4, 14, and 22, Miller et al teach wherein typing a first character of the selected alternative (Fig. 4: 402) directly into the text document (Fig. 2A&B), wherein it would be inherent that the addition of text characters (Fig. 4: 402) would be at the location of the text component because otherwise the word's components would not be symmetric in the document and unnecessarily difficult to read.

-In regard to dependent claims 5-6, 8, 15, and 23, Miller et al teach wherein the text input (selection) into a data file (text document) could include stochastic input sources such as a voice recognition and a hand-writing recognition device (column 1, lines 22-34).

-In regard to dependent claims 7, 9, 16-17, 24-25, Miller et al teach wherein the text input (selection) into a data file (text document) could include stochastic input sources such as a voice recognition and a hand-writing recognition device (column 1, lines 22-34). Miller et al also teach being able to input one character at a time (Fig. 4: 402) and as stated above in claims 4, 14, and 22 it would have been inherent that the addition of text characters (Fig. 4: 402) would be at the location of the text component because otherwise the word's components would not be symmetric in the document and unnecessarily difficult to read.

Art Unit: 2178

-In regard to dependent claims 11-12, 18-19, and 26-27, Miller et al teach a computer system and a computer readable medium having computer executable code (Fig. 1: 20)

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al (US: 5,896,321 04/20/99) in view of Oberteuffer et al (6,438,523 08/20/02).

-In regard to dependent claim 10, Miller et al do not teach wherein one of the stochastic text input devices is a vision-based recognition device for recognizing gestures. Oberteuffer et al teach multiple stochastic text inputs (Abstract) as well as a gesture interface for text input (Fig. 9: 902:904)(column 7, lines 44-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for at the time of the invention, for Miller et al to have utilized Oberteuffer et al gesture input device for inputting text, because it would have allowed users unable to use the speech to text of Miller et al to input text using sign language or other well known gestures.



***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed 02/10/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

-In regard to independent claim 1, Applicant argues that Miller et al fail to teach that after displaying the completion suggestions in the list box, receiving an edit to the partial data entry directly into the partial data entry in the text document such that the edit comprises a partial entry of a desired alternative to the partial data entry. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and feels that as shown above in the rejection of claim 1, Miller et al do teach these limitations. Looking at Fig. 4 in relation to Fig. 2A-B, Miller et al clearly shows that having displayed an initial list of completion suggestions (Step 418), and having not received an acceptance command (Step 424), Miller et al teaches receiving an additional character input edit (Step 402) into the text document (Step 406), wherein the additional character edit is a partial entry of a desired alternative to the partial data entry.

Applicant also argues that Miller et al also fails to disclose that in response to the edit, the list box is filtered to remove completion suggestion alternatives not associated with the partial entry, and in response to filtering the list box a revised list box of completion suggestion alternatives containing alternatives associated with the partial entry is displayed. The Examiner again respectfully disagrees and feels that as shown above in the rejection of claim 1, Miller et al do teach these limitations. Looking again at Fig. 4 in relation to Fig. 2A-B, Miller et al clearly that in response to an edit (receiving an additional character)(Step 402) a new filtered (Step 412) completion suggestion list box is displayed (Fig. 418). This was taught to be true for each

Art Unit: 2178

additional edit before a completion suggestion was accepted, wherein the new obtained prioritized list (Step 412) includes suggested alternatives associated with the edited partial entry.

-In regard to independent claim 13, Applicant argues that Miller et al fails to teach the same limitations mentioned above for claim 1, and in addition argues that Miller et al fails to disclose that if no acceptable completion suggestion alternative to the partial data entry is identified in the list box, receiving additional edits to the partial data entry in the text document to further filter the list and after receiving said edits displaying a further revised list of alternative completion suggestions. Looking again at Fig. 4 in relation to Fig. 2A-B, Miller et al clearly that in response to an edit (receiving an additional character)(Step 402) a new filtered (Step 412) completion suggestion list box is displayed (Fig. 418). This was taught to be true for each additional edit before a completion suggestion was accepted wherein the new obtained prioritized list (Step 412) includes suggested alternatives associated with the edited partial entry.

-In regard to independent claim 20, Applicant argues Miller et al fails to teach the same limitations mentioned above in claims 1 and 13. Please note the above arguments.

-In regard to dependent claim 10, Applicant argues that the combined teaching of Miller and Oberteuffer does not make obvious the limitations of the claim. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicants argument and maintains the above rejection for claim 10.

-In general the Examiner wishes to point out that the method for correcting text input into a text document as described by the claim limitations of the Applicant are equivalent to the prior art of Miller et al text completion system.

***Conclusion***

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam L Basehoar whose telephone number is (703) 305-7212. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:30am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALB

  
**JOSEPH FEILD**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**